

Com. Ghosh's brilliant analysis of the anti-revolutionary politics and thoughts of the Pseudo-Marxists

Mammoth Rally On November Day

The West Bengal State Committee of SUCI decided to observe the 57th anniversary of the great November Revolution in Russia through a ten-day programme from 7th November to 17th November this year. The programme started with Pin-flag collection by thousands of party volunteers when great enthusiasm had been observed among the common people who came forward to liberally contribute to the party's fighting fund. The programme also included group sittings, street corner and squad meetings, a Central mass meeting at Maidan and organised selling of party literature as a part of party's literary campaign.

On 8th November, a huge mass rally was held at Saheed Minar Maidan, Calcutta being attended by thousands of people—workers, peasants, students, youths, white-collar employees and, in fact, by all sections of our people.

The meeting was presided over by Com. Nihar Mukherjee, Secretary, West Bengal State Committee, SUCI.

Com. Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader, teacher and the General Secretary, who was the main speaker of the meeting said that the November Revolution in Russia is significant from so many aspects being the first of its kind in the history of mankind which overthrew bourgeois class rule under the leadership of the working class and did away with the exploitative system from the society. After the February revolution of 1917 when Tsardom was overthrown, the state power was captured by the Russian bourgeoisie and Kerensky Government was installed, a slogan was raised by the Mensheviks, the social revolutionaries and other pseudo-Marxist forces that the Soviets which came into being should seriously strive to get their demands i.e., the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution fulfilled by the new bourgeois government which could not be practically touched upon and remained unaccomplished so far. All these pseudo-Marxist forces pleaded that first of all,

the unfulfilled tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution should be completed and then and then only the question of entering into the phase of socialist revolution could come. Nobody can skip over a social phase at his sweet will.

Com. Ghosh explained that what prevailed upon in their mind was nothing but the widespread existence of feudal economy and the tremendous backwardness from which the Russian economy was suffering as also the bookish, wrong and the old understanding of Marxism that it is the economy that always supersedes politics. He said that April Thesis of Lenin offered a death blow to this old concept and established the very fact that Marxism is not economic determinism. Lenin correctly pointed out, Com. Ghosh observed, for the first time that where important political question like determination of phase of revolution was concerned it is definitely politics that supersedes economy. To go the other way round is to sink into economic determinism which is not only not Marxism but also alien to Marxism.

Com. Ghosh continued that Lenin clearly formulated in his famous April Thesis that the fundamental question of every revolution is the question of the state power and that the character and phase of every revolution depended on which class

(Contd. to Page 4)

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 8
No. 6

15th NOVEMBER '74
FRIDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

ON BEHAR MOVEMENT

Working People Must Develop Their Political Power to Advance Movement

The lessons of what is happening in Bihar, today, vindicate once more the reading of our Party that the people, oppressed under twenty seven years of capitalist exploitation and more so since Smt. Indira Gandhi came at the helm of administration, have reached at the end of their patience and can burst out any moment in any movement against the Government for realising their legitimate demands, whatsoever may be the character of the leadership provided in the movement. And in the event of a favourable situation, they are even prepared to jump in the movement on their own and to make sacrifice to any extent.

From the massive character of the movement which is giving expression to deep-seated mass discontent, it is now very clear that there was the clear possibility of forging a political united front of left and democratic parties on the basis of an agreed common programme which alone could provide the people with an instrument of struggle for a sustained movement. It is our party which made consistent attempts to build up this political united front of left and democratic parties but due to opposition mainly from the CPI(M) this attempt of ours did not meet with success.

It is due to the CPI(M)'s fanciful theory that as there is political difference between the parties, the formation of a political united front is not feasible and at best joint actions on issues can be made, that

nothing other than some joint mass actions could be materialised. Naturally, the golden opportunity of developing a mighty movement of the people by the left parties being lost, the rightist parties like Jana Sangha, Congress (O) and S. S. P. came in the forefront.

We all know that the movement originally started on some vital demand of the people like food, employment, education reform and eradication of corruption etc. In the course of the movement, at a certain stage, the demand—the justifiability of which can not be denied and as such supportable. But the question remains, should this incidental demand assume priority over the more fundamental, major and original demands of the people? So far as Sri Joy Prokash Narayan,

who, for whatever reasons has personally come in the forefront, is concerned we see that he has expressed different views at different times on this point—at one time he observed that dissolution of the assembly was not the main demand but in the statement made after his meeting with P. M., he said that the movement would continue as the demand for dissolution of assembly had not been conceded to. But the people were kept completely in the dark as to the fate of their original major demands.

Even if we assume for arguments sake that the assembly is dissolved, a fresh poll is held and a new government is formed to J P's liking, can the people expect a tangible better administration or redress of their grievances under the present circumstances? So the main point is to organise, lead and direct all these people's movements against capitalism, for the overthrow of the very exploitative capitalist system,—the breeding ground of all sorts of miseries of the common people.

From the different statements made by J P at (Contd. to Page 5)

The proposed move for declaring Calcutta University an institute of national importance.

—A heinous anti-autonomy drive in the field of education

Recently the Senate and the Academic Council of the Calcutta University, by a majority of votes have passed a motion urging upon the authorities that be, to declare the University of Calcutta, an institute of national importance.

Superficially the motion may appear to be innocent. Even a large section of the people who would fail to realise the real significance of the motion might consider the said to be a natural one—for who could deny the national importance of the said University with its great contribution to the academic field of our country? But even a layman would realise the real intention behind this move if he would throw even a cursory glance on the constitution of India where it has been clearly spelled out that the Parliament by law may whenever it thinks necessary declare any institution, an institute of national importance and thereby bring the said institution within the purview of the direct control of the Central Government. So it is now crystal clear that those who have supported the said motion in reality are trying to hand over an institution which possesses a great tradition of autonomy and academic freedom enjoying since its establishment that is for more than hundred years, to the Central Government.

Now let us see what reason they have put forward in support of their contention. A major objective behind this move that has been brought about in the public both by the Vice-Chancellor and others who have supported the move is to save the University from its present serious financial crisis. It has been observed that the Calcutta University can be saved from its present financial crisis only if its full responsibility is handed over to the Central Government.

We, however, think that this argument in favour of the said motion does not stand on the face of critical analysis. It is a fact that at present the University is facing with acute financial crisis and all concerned should seriously endeavour to save the institution from this crisis-ridden state. This can only be achieved if all concerned, including teachers, students, and the people of the state at large try to create pressure both on the Central and the state Governments to meet the necessary financial need of the University. But that does not necessitate the handing over of the control of the institution to the governmental bureaucracy. It would therefore appear that those who seriously think that the only way left to resolve the financial crisis of the University, is to hand over the latter to the Central Government are fighting shy to undertake serious endeavour and painstaking efforts to mount serious pressure on the governments for financial aids to resolve the financial impasse and hope to cheaply accomplish the task if it would be possible at all by handing over the full control of the University to the Central Government even at the cost of the long heritage of autonomy and freedom that the Calcutta University possesses behind its back.

A part from a very few who are perhaps supporting the move though wrongfully, for resolving the present financial impasse, the others especially the followers of the CPI and Congress(R) are moving with the motivated design of curbing the autonomy

that the Calcutta University has been enjoying for over a long period and are working as instruments for transforming the University into an appendage of the the government.

Such a motivated move endangering autonomy in the field of education and especially in the background of the demand for nationalisation of education i. e. the demand for bringing about education as a whole within the purview of the hegemony of the State, under the direct supervision of the State's executive apparatus namely the Central Government—a demand that is now being raised from different quarters, deserves a critical examination on the anvil of scientific and objective outlook in the background of the existing socio-political-economic condition of our country. This is particularly important in view of the fact that most of them who are supporting the present move also support the demand for nationalisation of education and perhaps consider their present move as to be consistent with their demand for nationalisation of education.

It is a fact that education is a very powerful weapon—perhaps one of the most powerful instruments that help to create, to handle and develop social mental make up. So, knowingly or unknowingly education system largely influences the social mind. Obviously in a class-divided society any issue or question relating to education can not be analysed or even discussed basing on fixed ideas or principles, independent of and without relating to, the issues of class struggle, class interest, capitalist state structure of our country etc. etc. Educational problem is not a supra-class problem—not a problem that can be seen with equal eye both

by the bourgeois, the capitalist class, and the proletariat, the working people of the country in the midst of intensive class struggle.

Education being a part and parcel of the superstructure, in a class-divided society, like that of ours, both the capitalists and the revolutionary working people will try to stipulate it. And the ruling capitalist class enjoying the State power naturally is in a dominant position to stipulate education in its own interest than that of others with the help of different apparatus of the State.

Now in our country when parliamentary democracy was at its early stage, when comparatively a wider democratic environment was in existence, and when in economic sphere free competition comparatively prevailed on a broader scale, the educational institutions enjoyed greater autonomy—a thing inseparably linked up with the concepts of freedom and democracy of the socio-political life, and the tendency to establish governmental bureaucratic control over education and academic institutions was not then strongly felt. But the growth of monopoly capitalism which eventually eliminated free competition in the economic field, has its corresponding effect in curbing the democratic rights of the people and curtailing the autonomy of educational institutions, particularly that of the universities and thereby establishing governmental control over them. Moreover, the steps and measures that are being adopted by the ruling capitalist class through its different powerful tools including the Central Government clearly reveal that it is aiming at laying down all-out fascism in the country. In the academic sphere, in conformity with this drive for laying down the rock-bottom foundation of fascism, gradually governmental control is being

more established over the educational institutions at the cost of their autonomy, for bringing about regimentation of thought and fascization.

It is clear even to a layman that the existence of autonomy in the field of education works as a precondition for the creation of cross currents of thoughts and ideas, free from the influence and domination of the powers that be, out of which the correct, scientific views and truths can emerge and establish themselves—a thing which is essential in the field of education that tackles the domain of knowledge and epistemology. For this reason any man having even the least faith on freedom and democracy feels the necessity of preserving autonomy in the field of education, by keeping itself free from the pernicious influence of the governmental bureaucracy. Even the Gajendra Gadkar Committee of the UGC on governance of university and colleges, could not ignore the role of autonomy in the field of education and had to observe, "The concept of university autonomy is often misunderstood. It is not a "legal" concept, not even a "constitutional" concept. It is an ethical concept and an academic concept....The claim for autonomy is made by the University, not as a matter of privilege, but on the ground that such an autonomy is a condition precedent if the universities are to discharge their duties and obligations effectively and efficiently as regards imparting and advancement of knowledge and also making their unique contribution to the life and development of nation."

In this background the establishment of State control over education and curbing of autonomy of educational institutions will amount to a suppression of thoughts and views which though may be correct but anta-

(Contd. to Page 3)

As such nationalisation of education can not be opposed in principle

(Contd. from Page 2)

gonistic to the interest of the ruling capitalist class of the country who is driving at using education, a powerful medium for controlling the social mind, for propagating its own class thoughts and views, by forcibly imposing them over others and thereby leading to a state of complete regimentation of thought in the field of knowledge and epistemology.

Now, a pertinent question is; in such a background, in the present condition of our country where the level of democratic consciousness of the people is low and their movement is weak and divided, whether the demand for nationalisation of education which amounts to bringing about the education as a whole within the purview of the capitalist State control is to be supported or not. In this regard we would like to refer to what once Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher has observed while addressing an assembly of teachers, students and other workers of the educational fronts.

He has observed that from the point of view of reflecting social urge of the people, nationalisation of education as such can not be opposed in general and on the point of principle. At present there is no pure and simple theoretical general principle to oppose the demand for nationalisation of education—a demand that is being manifested as an urge for social transformation. But the matter is not so simple and the issue is related to the present set up and the pertinent question is, whether at present we will raise this slogan demanding the nationalisation of education. For we may demand many things, but we raise the demand for any particular thing in the form of a slogan, then and then only, when it reflects the real necessity of the situation and arises

out of the existing objective condition of our struggle. Now the question is, whether the present situation, the condition and the strength of the democratic movement are appropriate for raising the slogan for nationalisation of education.

At present even the so-called communists are not secular; they are quite ignorant and innocent of the real purpose and objective of education. When they discuss on any issue relating to education they discuss like academicians and pedagogues. They are not even conscious of the fact that in their discussions they often behave like bourgeois intellectuals. At present, the level of cultural and ethical standard of the people in general and the persons connected with education in particular is very low. The democratic movement of the people is weak and divided. It does not possess the strength sufficient enough to frustrate the attempt of the ruling capitalist class to bring about regimentation of thought and fascization by establishing its hegemony over education, to stipulate the education system and thereby utilise this powerful instrument that can really influence the social mind for propagating its own class thoughts, ideals and philosophy and suppress that of the others. In such a state of affair the raising of the slogan of the demand for nationalisation of education at present simply means to play as an instrument, to be instrumental in the hands of the bourgeoisie for bringing about complete fascization in the field of education. In that case, knowing fully well, we will be simply handing over such a powerful instrument that handles the social mind to the despotic administration. Those who are at present raising the demand for nationalisation of education are simply doing that. So, at present the demand for nationalisation of

education is unrealistic. Though we do not oppose nationalisation of education as a matter of principle, a fact that we have already observed, but after considering many other things like the present position of the democratic movement, the attitude of the government, the fascistic tendencies of regimentation etc., we firmly hold the view that at present this slogan goes against the interest of the people; it only helps the bourgeoisie, the ruling capitalist class to establish its control over education.

But if the situation had been such and such that, the left and democratic movement, the leftism, the revolutionary movement of the country would have been sufficiently powerful, existing on a higher level basing on higher ethical and cultural values of life, and upholding a correct, clear-cut scientific and secular concept, and for the realisation of which all the left and democratic forces would have been unitedly fighting a fierce struggle having a powerful basis then, would we still have opposed the slogan for the demand for nationalisation of education? Then we might have revised our opinion. Even if on the very next day the character of the democratic movement in our country becomes such that it is no more restricted within the sphere of economism, and is reflecting a materialistic tune, a secular tune in culture and education and those who are participating in the struggle in the teachers, students and youth fronts of the movement are reflecting from all aspects of their life a higher ethical and cultural values, a new and scientific, secular approach to education and it does really possess sufficient strength to force the government to bend down before the people; if such be the position and strength of the movement then should we still oppose the slogan of nationalisation of education? Then, perhaps we would raise the

slogan of nationalisation of education.

So, at present, so long as the condition-shifting and over all change, not only in the magnitude or momentum of the movement, but also in the character of the movement the politico cultural background of the movement do not take place, till an outlook of the revolutionary fighting people based on a secular and scientific approach to the issue is not reflected in the educational movement and until and unless it gathers momentum adequate enough to create an over all impact over the society and compel the government to surrender before the people's movement till then we consider the demand for nationalisation of education not only unrealistic but dangerous too. And to day, those who are raising this slogan, urging for the establishment of governmental control over education, under whatsoever pretext they may do this, but in reality they are acting as instruments in the hands of the ruling capitalist class engaged in its endeavour to bring about fascization and regimentation of thought in education.

So long it has been discussed though, of course very briefly (in my own language—writer) what Com. Shibdas Ghosh, one of the greatest Marxist-Leninist thinkers of the era has observed in regard to the question of nationalisation of education. In our opinion and we hope that every right thinking man will agree with us that regarding the issues like the establishment of governmental control over the educational institutions, vis-a-vis the curbing of autonomy of the latter and nationalisation of education, the observations made by Com. Ghosh will always work as the correct scientific and objective guide-line.

Now, let us see what the initiators of the present move have observed in their vain bid to confuse the others through their childish utterances that

the apprehension of the possible curbing of autonomy of the University is not at all real; as if it is a fanciful creation of those who are opposing the move. The movers have tried to draw others' attention to two things.

Firstly, They have observed that the apprehension of the possible attack on the autonomy of the University has no objective basis, because the existing centrally controlled universities, according to to them also enjoy autonomy.

Without entering into a detail analysis of the letters of the Acts of the said Universities, which if undertaken will reveal that after so many amendments of its Act, so many attacks on its autonomy, the Calcutta University still now enjoys more autonomy than each and every one of them, we would like to observe that the matter is not so simple.

We have earlier observed that the attempts to curb autonomy of educational institutions was not so much felt in the decades past, for reasons that too we have previously discussed and as a result, the universities that are under the control of the governments from a much earlier period comparatively enjoy more autonomy than the institutions that are being established or taken under the control of the governments in recent periods. In case of these universities the Acts have been modelled in conformity with this heinous attempt to establish gradually more governmental control over them. So, there is every justified reason to apprehend that the real motive behind the present move is also to curb autonomy by establishing governmental control over an University that perhaps still enjoy the maximum autonomy among all the universities through out the whole country.

Those who, referring to the Acts of some of the centrally controlled (Contd. to Page 6)

Marxism is not Economic determinism

—Lesson of November Revolution

(Contd. from Page 1)

or classes wielded state power and which class alongwith which other classes would overthrow the existing state machine. Lenin did not suggest on a single occasion that as Russian economy was backward, as not only remnants of feudalism were there but also dominance of feudalism was discernible in some cases in Russian economy, so Russia was in the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution. Lenin, on the contrary, pointed out that *to the extent* the old class i.e., the feudal landed nobility was replaced by a new class i.e., the bourgeoisie, democratic revolution in Russia *was completed*. The unfulfilled tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution, under that circumstances, had to be carried to completion by the proletariat themselves and historically these tasks were thrust upon their shoulder. These were, in fact, the *derivative tasks*, the *by products* of Russian socialist revolution as because the unaccomplished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution got interwoven under the specific historical situation. Thus in spite of the fact that the *strategic slogan* in Russia was changed from "the alliance with the whole of peasantry" before February to "alliance with the poor peasants" after February-March revolution, *tactically* the Bolshevik Party had to seek support of the *whole* of the peasantry in so far as the question of fulfilment of the democratic tasks was concerned for a long period after October 1917, even after the banning of the constituent Assembly and establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Those pseudo-Marxist forces who failed to grasp the significance of November revolution were time and again severely criticised by Lenin who showed that *to the extent* the state power was to be

transferred from the hands of *an old class* i.e., the bourgeoisie to the hands of *a new class* i.e., the proletariat, *to that extent* it was clearly in the phase of socialist revolution notwithstanding the widespread prevalence of feudal economy and open alliance of the new government with the monarchist elements.

This is the cream and essence of the Leninist teaching of November revolution. Those in India, who are frantically but vainly searching after whether there is still any remnant of feudalism or argue whether it is possible to skip over a social phase or not while determining the stage of Indian revolution, have hopelessly failed to grasp this valuable teaching of Lenin, Com Ghosh remarked.

These so-called communists of our country have not only forgotten the valuable lesson that a country can enter into the phase of socialist revolution even before completing the unfinished tasks of bourgeois democratic revolution but have also created a puzzle by inventing a so-called new phase of People's Democratic Revolution in between the phases of Bourgeois Democratic and Socialist Revolution. They have, on the one hand, fallen victim to economic determinism and on the other, made Marxism-Leninism a dogma by developing a peculiar cult of quotation-mongering from Marxist classics out of context either due to ignorance or with a view to hoodwinking the people.

The November revolution underlined another important lesson i.e. the indispensable necessity of establishing working class hegemony in the struggles for national independence. Since the world capitalism became out and out reactionary and entered the stage of imperialism so the national bourgeoisie in colonial countries in spite

of remaining and participating in freedom struggles became unable to lead these struggles to their logical conclusions in view of their own fear-complex of revolution. It is for this reason that these national revolutions or the freedom struggles were sure to be completed in a half-baked and truncated way if and when led by this reformist oppositional or compromising national bourgeoisie. In the present era of "imperialism and proletarian revolution" even the national liberation struggles can reach their logical culmination only when they are led by the proletariat. Com. Ghosh explained that it was, therefore, the task of the genuine Communists to paralyse the instability of the vacillating and compromising national bourgeoisie during our freedom movement which, the so-called Communist Party of India miserably failed due to their failure to realise the significance of November Revolution, as a result of which the national bourgeoisie got control of the Indian state bringing in its wake tremendous pauperisation and poverty of the Indian people.

On the question of national state Com. Ghosh held that the national state ensures the freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism in a given situation and the economic dependence of such a state has nothing to do with the character of a national state. Com. Ghosh recalled this Leninist teaching and how Lenin solved this question long ago, who said, "Not only small state, but even Russia, for example, is economically entirely dependent on the power of the imperialist finance capitals of rich bourgeois countries. Not only the miniature Balkan States but even America in the nineteenth century was economically a colony of Europe...but it has nothing whatsoever to do with the

question of.....national state."

But the so-called Communist Parties of India are still confusing this question and very often characterising Indian state as semi-feudal and semi-colonial in character in contravention to this great historical teaching about national state. Com Ghosh said that the kind of state that was established in India through transference of political power is a national state ensuring freest, widest and speediest development of capitalism in the given condition and this national state is nothing but a capitalist state machine.

The overthrow of this capitalist state machine by the proletariat is the fundamental question before Indian revolution which is socialist revolution indeed, and to confuse this basic question under whatsoever pretext means to betray the very cause of Indian revolution.

Com. Ghosh explained that Indian capitalist economy has not only developed monopoly, it has also assumed imperialistic characteristic through the formation of finance capital and financial oligarchy by destroying to some extent, its erstwhile national character. Monopoly capitalism, he continued, indicates a particular degree of development of capitalism and the slogan of fighting monopoly capitalism without fighting capitalism as such is a subtle way of shielding and protecting the Indian bourgeoisie from the wrath and attack of the common people. The so-called Communist Parties in India are discharging exactly this very responsibility.

On the question of infiltration of capitalism in agriculture Com. Ghosh recalled the Leninist teaching that it is not the form of land ownership but the relations of production, character of trade and commerce of the agricultural produce that mainly determine the nature and character of agricultural economy. He said that Lenin showed that there had been

infiltration of capitalism in the agricultural economy of Russia basing on this yardstick of relations of production in the countryside and the character of trade and commerce of the agricultural produce. But today in India Com. Ghosh said that not only there has been infiltration of capitalism in agriculture, the entire Indian agricultural economy has already been completely transformed into capitalist economy which the so-called communists of our country are failing to notice.

Com. Ghosh said that those who ridicule at our idea of non-existence of feudalism in Indian economy but existence of feudal influence in the domain of culture, mental make-up, habits etc. on the plea that "since base is absent how can superstructure continue to lay its influence" are completely ignorant of the nature of the mutual relationship between base and superstructure. These people take a very mechanical understanding of the relation between base and superstructure. No doubt, the superstructure is built upon a base, but after it comes into being, it attains a relatively independent character and can exist as hang-over for long even after the base is overthrown. The superstructure does not die out instantaneously or automatically. In the realm of superstructure an antagonistic contradiction sets in, between the new superstructure and the hang-over of the old one. Com. Ghosh observed that it would be wrong to say that Indian people—the students, youths, and the working class do not want struggle. It will be equally wrong to assume that as they are peace-loving so they are opposed to struggles and revolution. History does not corroborate that. Rather people of India have jumped into struggles again and again but what was lacking, was the existence of a genuine revolutionary party and a correct base political line for which these struggles

(Contd. to Page 8)

CPI and CPI(M) Reflecting Anti-Movement Opportunist Attitude

(Contd. from Page 1)

different time in the course of the movement—be it about his concept of 'Socialism' or reported 'Partyless democracy' or about the course and perspective of the movement, nothing clear has so far emerged. Rather, his different inconsistent opinions, at times contradictory, confuse the real issues.

In this connection, it is to be noted however, that a section of the monopolist who from their bourgeois-parliamentary interest do not like this virtually unopposed dictatorship of Smt. Gandhi in the bourgeois parliamentary politics of the country, have come out in the open to extend their support to J P particularly in view of his stature, with a view to developing an effective opposition as can be seen from the support J P is drawing from a section of administration and bourgeois press.

Despite these weaknesses, there is no denying the fact that the very appearance and association of a man like J P's standing in the movement on the vital demand of the people on the one hand, and momentum of the movement gradually growing and ultimately taking a massive character opened up an immense possibility before the left and democratic forces to give this movement an organised shape, isolate the rightist forces and lead the movement on correct track.

But it is really unfortunate that none of the big left parties have been able to approach the movement correctly. As for S. P., it did not lose time to join the bandwagon of the rightist heroes smelling the narrow parliamentary benefit that might accrue.

The CPI took the role of direct opposition to the peoples' struggle on their legitimate demands on the so-called plea of 'rightist leadership'. Granting the rightist leadership in the movement, granting the

movement being tried to be exploited by a section of the monopolists, yet how can they brand the poor and oppressed masses and their struggle against the capitalist government reactionary? It's a novel experience, a novel variety of 'marxism' which shows its impudence to brand the legitimate demands as also the struggle of the exploited masses as reactionary, unprecedented in the degree of opportunism in history.

By opposing a movement which has given expression to the accumulated discontent of the people against the government, in the name of fighting right reaction in such a naked and unabashed manner, outdoing even the ruling party, the CPI in reality has defeated its own politics by helping the same right reaction to appear as champion of people's cause—will the CPI ranks ponder over it?

The CPI(M) resorted to a different trick. On the same pretext as it was with the CPI, it completely kept aloof from the actual struggle of the people although it felt no difficulty when along with these rightist parties like Jana-Sangha and Congress(O) it organised bandhs in Maldah and Bankura districts in West Bengal, made electoral alliances or understanding with these parties (Swatantra Party included) in Orissa or such alliances or understanding in Tamilnadu, Goa and Kerala where it is now having no difficulty in forging electoral alliance with Muslim League, a communal party, and Kerala Congress. But when the question of participation in people's struggle, the question of building it up and conducting it on correct track came, it suddenly smelt foul of the presence of these rightist parties, who in absence of the united front of left and democratic parties were simply exploiting the situation for a narrow parliamentary

games. This shows that CPI(M) feels no responsibility, whatsoever of freeing the exploited masses from the political-ideological influence of these rightist parties and forces.

But the funniest of all, this party now issues directive to its state unit to 'dissociate' from the movement! The question of 'dissociation' according to simple logic can come only after 'association'. But can they say when and in what manner did this party 'associate' at all with the movement? Then why is it saying so loudly of its 'dissociation'? Is it for other reason? Is it to satisfy Smt. Gandhi and the Soviet revisionist leadership about its good conduct to both of whom, it is now common knowledge, this party is trying to move closer?

This is one side of CPI(M)'s so-called politics. But there is another side. As an opportunist social-democratic party, they also understand that in view of the movement gaining peoples' massive support and their actual involvement against the government, the anti-ruling party sentiment of the people will surely find expression in the coming election. And J P holding a pivotal position in the movement will be an important 'factor' in the coming election, no doubt. So, even not involving in actual struggle of the people, if any chance in winning a few seats in the coming election of the assembly is to be ensured that can only be done by winning the favour, the blessings of J P. So, guided by this calculation, the leaders of CPI(M) are, off and on, meeting J P and having secret talks with him. They are however very meticulous to see that all these meetings with J P get wide press-publicity. J P also wants to associate this party, though in name only, with the movement so that he can show that not only the rightists but even the

leftist like the CPI(M) is also with him. From this mutuality of interests his meetings and talks with the CPI(M) leaders are getting wide press-publicity whereby the CPI(M) tries to maintain just the appearance, the show of its so-called concern for the people's struggle in Bihar.

So the CPI(M)'s political stand is in no way different from that of the CPI excepting that while the CPI is directly opposing, it is keeping itself completely aloof but maintaining stance and posture as if it is participating in the movement. It is far more dangerous because it is far more deceptive.

The formation of united front of left and democratic parties, on the basis of a common agreed programme—the only course to keep the people's movement free from the political-ideological influence of the rightist forces repeatedly placed by us, was opposed by the CPI(M) before but now the same party keeps itself completely aloof from people's struggles on the plea of rightists' participation. This is nothing other than avoiding peoples struggles on some plea or other—will the CPI(M) cadres pause and ponder over it?

In the background of all these factors, the all-important question before our party as it should be before any real revolutionary party, was: what should be the stand? Should it be unnerved by the complexity of the situation? Should it remain a dumb spectator to all sorts of vile parliamentary games of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties and personalities? Should it allow the playing with peoples' just demands, massive participation and tremendous sacrifices by these forces, by keeping it isolated from the struggling masses? Or should it take courage to be with the masses trying its utmost to give a correct orientation to their struggle on base political line of

the proletariat by means of independent programme striving continuously at the sametime to maintain the unity in the struggle of the common people at the base level? Our Party took up the latter position as that alone is in full conformity with our class position and angularity and the historic responsibility which we never shirked and can never shirk simply on the plea of complexity. Since then, we have been in the thick of the peoples struggle which will be borne out by the fact that although we are not a big political force in Bihar about two hundred Comrades of our party including Comrades, Amar Kumar Pandey, member of the Bihar State Committee, Secretary, State Committee of U.T.U.C. (Lenin Sarani) and distinguished popular leader of the State, Maheswar Upadhyaya a leading organiser, Benoy Chandra Singh and Sib Chandra Singh, President and Vice-President respectively of A. I. D. S. O. Mazaffarpur District Committee were arrested under the D.I.R, M. I. S. A and other preventive acts. Such arrests and tortures have been going on in Arah, Marhaora, Dumka, Mazaffarpur, Danapur, Chhapra, Dhanbad and other districts and places. This testifies the fact that a bourgeois government is seldom mistaken in its judgment of class-enemy amongst its host of political opponents.

Our Bihar State Committee has therefore called upon the working people to win the political initiative of the movement in their hands by organising themselves, without least delay in Jana Sangram Samity in every village and mahalla, keeping at the same, the broad-unity of the struggling masses. They also should be in readiness to advance their struggle, should the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties desert them in half way of the struggle or try to divert their movement to narrow

(Contd. to Page 8)

At present the slogan of nationalisation of education is anti-people

(Contd. from Page 3)

universities are trying to defend their contention that the apprehension of the possible attack on the autonomy of the Calcutta University is unreal, should also take note of the fact that governmental control can even be maintained in different surreptitious ways and means over the educational institutions without amending the Acts which under the circumstances may still appear to be preserving autonomy intact. At times, this surreptitious method helps them more. For, in such cases they can maintain their hegemony but at the same time on being accused of curbing the autonomy they can try to pose themselves honest and confuse the people by trying to draw their attention to the letters of the Acts which still preserves the spirit of autonomy. Can they deny the fact that also in those universities which they usually refer to, the government maintains its hegemony in different surreptitious ways and means though the Acts may appear to be protecting autonomy? Is it not a fact that a particular Central University is *de facto* controlled by a particular political party of the country who is at present engaged in keeping the ruling Congress(R) party always in good humour? Is there any such provision in the Act? Of course not. But that has not created any hurdle to maintain their hegemony over the said University. In fact the situation can be easily grasped if any one tries to follow what is exactly happening at present in the socio-political arena of our country. In the letters of our constitution still there are provisions of 'lofty' democratic fundamental rights but in reality such rights are being curtailed and trampled down more and more as the process of rock-bottom foundation of fascism is gradually becoming more consolidated strengthened and firmly rooted though the

said rights are still formally preserved in the constitution.

It is really astonishing that when the capitalist state through its executive apparatus is earnestly trying to establish its influence and hegemony over education and educational institutions either directly by framing suitable new Acts, or by amending the existing Acts or indirectly in different heinous surreptitious means even when there is no such provision in the relevant Acts, a handful of so-called educationists and intellectuals who often even proclaim themselves as 'progressives' are mastering strong behind a move that will only pave the path leading to the curbing of autonomy by establishing governmental control over an University that possesses a great tradition of autonomy and freedom since the pre-independent days in our country.

Secondly, those who are trying to defend the present move are helplessly trying to impress on others and carry them in support of their move by observing that if the question be of preserving the autonomy of the University, which is being apprehended to be endangered by the present move of handing over its control over to the Central Government, who can dare say that the autonomy would not be curbed through increasing bureaucratic control by the state Government?

This is really a very weak, faulty argument and childish too. At least we do not disagree with the fact that the attempt to curb autonomy of the universities through the establishment of gradually increasing governmental control and the supersession of the universities on lame excuses and weak pleas are being observed on the part of the state governments also. At present, education being a state subject, the ruling capitalist class would naturally try to stipulate education, with a view to

handling such a powerful instrument to influence the social mental make up through the state governments. Acts of the different universities that have been established in the last decades and are being established recently in different states and the supersession of the different universities by the state governments, the latest sinister drive in this respect being the supersession of the Utkal University in Orissa, all bear testimony to our contention. It is also our experience that for some times past the state Government in West Bengal, in different surreptitious and heinous means is trying to establish its influence over the Calcutta University and thereby threatening its autonomy.

So it is a naked fact and natural too that the state governments are also endeavouring to curb the autonomy of the universities and thereby establish the hegemony of the ruling capitalist class over education and all concerned including the left and democratic people should struggle to frustrate this bid. But we can not understand, how can this be a reason in defence of the move that would open the path for a more easy and quicker establishment of the said hegemony, which the so-called intellectuals are trying to put up for supporting their proposal?

But, side by side this is to be kept in mind that at present, in case of the Calcutta University, instead of any attempt to be undertaken by the state Government, it would be far more easy for the ruling class to take the same drive to establish its control through the Central Government by trying to create public opinion in favour of the move on the plea that the financial crisis being then resolved the condition of the crisis-ridden University would radically improve. And in fact, attempts are already being made in this direction by those who have championed the

present move as their venerable cause. A large number of these so-called intellectuals and educationists who have put their shoulder to the wheel for aiding the capitalist class engaged in establishing its hegemony on education, who are trying heart and soul to serve as the faithful instruments of the ruling capitalist class in the field of education have undertaken the Sisyphean task of convincing the teachers, students and the public at large in different ways. They are even trying to allure the teachers and other employees of the University by creating a rosy picture of the future. In different writings and meetings they have observed that if the University is transformed into a centrally controlled institution then their pay-scales will much improve, their financial condition will radically change etc.

It is no doubt a fact that the financial conditions of the teachers and other employees of the educational field and academic institutions are in a pitiable state deserving a radical improvement. And in a country where the government looks upon the financial problem of education in a very casual manner and refuses to bear with the burden of full financial responsibility of education serious and effective pressure should have to be mounted on the government to compel it to accept the full financial responsibility of education and thereby save education and educational institutions from their present financial crisis. This is more important not only for the reason that in any civilised country the government cannot ignore to bear with the financial responsibility of education. It is far more important in view of the fact that in our country the government refuses to take over the full financial responsibility of education on the plea of financial stringency, whereas there is never any shortage of fund to spend money more and more in increasing crores for the police and

military budgets, for experiments on atomic explosion. It can not provide money for education but lakhs and lakhs of public money it can provide for crushing rail strike and similar other legitimate democratic movements of the people.

But what these so-called intellectuals are doing is completely a different thing. Instead of urging for developing movement against the government with a view to realising the improvement of the financial condition of the University, the teachers and others, they are simply alluring the teachers and other employees of the University with a colourful picture of better financial prospects which according to them would ensue following the takeover of the University by the Central Government and thus trying to mobilise them in support of their heinous move. Does it not tantamount to the dirty tactics of the dangling of carrot before the starving horse for utilising the latter as a means to realise one's desired aim?

It is a pity that to day the leaders of the University (headed by the Vice-Chancellor) are eager to surrender the freedom, the autonomy of the University on the plea that the government would then come forward with financial help to solve the present financial crisis. But once in the past when the University was facing with acute financial crisis, the then leading stalwarts of the University refused the offer of financial help from the government, as it, *being clogged with conditions might endanger the freedom, the autonomy of the University.* (Italics-ours). None can forget their historic observations which even to-day are equally true as it was in those days.

"Let the government abdicate its functions if it likes.....we shall not go down on our knees. We are not to cry peccavi, we are not charity boys. We

(Contd. to Page 7)

Kerala School Of Politics

Tremendous Enthusiasm

Among The Participants

The Kerala State Organising Committee of the SUCI organised a School of Politics at Quilon on and from 23rd to 25th October '74. Members, supporters and close sympathisers of the party numbering about hundred from five districts viz., Quilon, Trivandrum, Alleppey, Kottayam and Ernakulam attended the School. Those who attended covered a very good cross section of the society starting from professors, teachers, college students, white colour employees to representatives of workers and peasants.

Com. Pritish Canda, a member of the Central Committee and Com. Sukomal Dasgupta, a member of the West Bengal Secretariat of the party conducted the school.

The subject matter *inter alia* included:

Dialectical and historical materialism—the dialectical methodological approach and fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism as

concretised, developed and elaborated on Indian soil by our beloved leader, teacher and the General Secretary, Com. Shibdas Ghosh.

Present political situation—emergence of Indian state as the most modern and centralised capitalist state, the growth of monopoly capital, finance capital and financial oligarchy in Indian economy and the role of Indian capitalist class, as the junior partner of International Trust and Cartel; Phase of Indian revolution, futility of the theory of People's Democratic Revolution and National Democratic Revolution, Vis-a-Vis the indispensable necessity of Socialist Revolution in India.

Why the parties moving under the nomenclature of communism failed to develop as genuine working class party—the correct concept of democratic centralism, collective leadership and the process of formation of a working

Anti-autonomy move

(Contd. from Page 6)

are not Oliver twists..... We had better close down the concern, lock up the gates of the University and go about the country for support." Again. "This University will not be a manufactory of slaves. We want to think truly. We want to teach freedom. We shall inspire the rising generation with thoughts and ideals that are high and ennobling. We shall not be a part of the Secretariat of the Government.....If you give me slavery in one hand and money in the other, I despise the offer..... Freedom first, freedom second, freedom always, nothing else will satisfy

class party and how the SUCI has developed as the genuine working class party in India under the leadership of Com. Shibdas Ghosh.

The School was a great success as it has generated tremendous enthusiasm, inspiration among the participants and created a sense of determination among them.

me."

It is no doubt encouraging that a large section of the educationists, teachers and students, not only those who are connected with different left and democratic parties but also others who have faith in democracy and autonomy have come forward to frustrate this anti-autonomy, anti-democratic move of a handful of so-called educationists who are acting as pawns in the hand of the ruling capitalist class. Here again the approach of some people appears to be contradictory. Let us cite the case of the CPI(M). In the past, the party lent support to the demand for nationalisation of education whereas at present, without modifying their previous position they are opposing the present move with a view to keeping education within the purview of the state control. This is no doubt a contradictory position. For, anyone can easily understand that nationalisation of education means bringing about education completely within the

(Contd. to Page 8)

KERALA

MEMORIAL MEETING

Quilon District Organising Committee of the SUCI organised a condolence meeting at Punukkanur on the premature demise of Com. Subodh Banerjee, one of the Central Committee members of the party and a most revered mass leader. The meeting was presided over by Com. C.K. Lukose, Com. J. James, Secretary of the State Organising Committee was the main speaker. He explained how the front-ranking student of the great Marxist thinker, Com. Shibdas Ghosh served revolution and the country, how he helped democratic mass struggles to grow through parliamentary and extra parliamentary struggles and how he was a life-long revolutionary.

Though there was intermittent rain, a large number of people attended the meeting. A condolence resolution was adopted in the meeting and one minute's silence was observed in memory of Com. Subodh Banerjee.



Comrade Pritish Chanda discussing at the School of Politics of the party workers of Kerala State SUCI. At the dais are seen (Left to right) Comrades, C. K. Lukose, N. N. Raja Gopal, Krishna Chakraborty, S. Baboo, J. James (Secretary, Kerala State Organising Committee), Pritish Chanda (Member of the Central Committee), Sukomal Dasgupta (Member of the W.B. State Secretariat) and V. Natarajan. At the right under the portrait of Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, General Secretary of our party, is inscribed a translation in Malayalam of a quotation from Comrad Ghosh: "The Kernel, the living soul of any lofty ideal, any philosophy or any worthy ideology lies in its cultural, ethical and aesthetic standard".

Assemble Under The Banner Of SUCI —The Real Revolutionary Working Class Party

(Contd. from Page 4)
repeatedly met with failures. But since people will have to be engaged in struggles—if not at the dictate of humanity, definitely due to impact of life—it is imperative that they find out the real revolutionary party and the correct base political line without which no struggle can be victorious.

In this connection Comrade Ghosh referred to the report of the tenth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party in which it has been emphasised that the revolutionary politics and the correct base political line decides everything. Those who have everything but not the revolutionary politics or the correct base political line have, in fact, nothing and are destined to meet with failure ultimately. Com. Ghosh paid tribute to this observation of the CPC and said that our party, SUCI, had to stand very firmly from its very inception on this particular understanding of ethics of Marxism.

Com. Ghosh said that when we speak of revolutionary politics that should cover the ethical, moral and cultural aspects as well. We cannot forget for a moment that the strength of a party, including member, supporter and sympathiser, is bound to be a microscopic minority in comparison to the total population of a country. If we ignore this vast multitude outside the periphery of the party and count much only on the organisational strength of the party itself, even if it is quite strong and big then also no party can bring about revolution. Because one of the essential conditions for the success of revolution of any country is that the masses of the people become either direct or passive supporter of revolution or at least take a benevolently neutral attitude towards revolu-

tion i.e., do not directly go against revolution. This vast multitude of the masses can be made passive supporter or benevolently neutral not by the political appeal alone but by the cultural, moral and ethical appeal which the vanguards of revolution should always carry along with them to the masses. It means that simply by shouting slogans, and agitating the masses against the government on any question, we cannot achieve this task, we cannot bring about revolution. A genuine revolutionary party, therefore, cannot afford to neglect to constantly uplift the cultural, moral and ethical standard of the rank and file.

At the conclusion Com. Ghosh appealed to the people to fulfil the following three conditions:—

(1) The real revolutionary party with revolutionary politics and correct base political line being organisationally capable of providing leadership to the revolutionary movements of our country.

(2) The formation of a political United Front on the basis of a minimum common programme to fight against the common enemy and to develop it as the instrument of struggle in the hands of the people at this phase of democratic mass movements ensuring a healthy atmosphere for conducting ideological struggles to resolve the differences among the partners of the front on various issues concerning tactics and strategy while fighting unitedly against the common enemy.

(3) Develop political power in the hands of the people i.e., to build up, politically conscious, invincible organisations of the masses that can conduct not only local struggles for achieving certain demands but in the event of breaking up of a favourable situation can start insurrection for seizure of power.

Attempt to curb autonomy

(Contd. from Page 7)

purview of the control of the Centre but not under the control of the states. For, if it is kept under the control of the states, then it can never be freed from regional tinge which basically contradicts the very idea of nationalisation.

But for what underlying reasons our CPI(M) friends have had to take this contradictory position are anybody's guess. They harbour the idea that in near future they may come to governmental power through election at least in some states. So if education remains a state subject then they would be able to establish their control over education and educational institutions that they once nakedly and in the most narrow partisan manner attempted in the near past, when they were the major partners in the last UF Governments in certain states. But to come to power in the centre, in near future—is an illusory idea to them which they cannot even dream of at present. So at present, the idea of establishing Central control over education is taboo to them. But if ever the position changes, and the prospect of attaining power in the Central Government through election even brightens to the least, then they would perhaps urge for bringing about education under the control of the Central Government. We would then not be astonished to hear them raising the slogan 'more the centralisation, more the nationalisation by the Central Government, more the progress!'

Lastly in our conclusion, we would like to urge upon the left and democratic people in general and the teachers, students and educational workers in particular to develop strong movement for the preservation of autonomy in the educational field—a movement that should be viewed as a

ASSAM Hunger Strike by DSO

Gauhati: Under the auspices of the Dhubri District Committee of AIDSO, about 50 workers staged a 12-hour hunger strike on the 21st October at Gauhati demanding immediate declaration of Dhubri sub-division as a famine area where more than 15000 people already died.

A five member deputation team led by Comrade Kantimoy Deb, Secretary Assam State Committee of AIDSO met the Chief Minister and urged him to concode to their demand.

Behar Movement

(Contd. from Page 5)
parliamentary confines.

By these, their own instruments of struggle, the working people will have to conduct their movement in such a way that the ultimate struggle of emancipation from the capitalist yoke under the leadership of a real revolutionary party, by successful completion of the tasks of Socialist Revolution in our country becomes nearer.

By organising their instruments of struggle and their class Party, the S.U.C.I., the working people can only march forward to their desired goal. Comrade, Shibdas Ghosh is teaching and guiding the army revolutionaries how to conduct complicated battles of democratic movements with the sole purpose of building up the political power of the proletariat and semi-proletariat. Comrade, Shibdas Ghosh is imparting the revolutionary lessons to train up and steel the army of revolutionaries with the revolutionary purpose so that one day, the army swelling in number and steeled in experiences can lead the battle of the oppressed and exploited people along the base proletarian line—the overthrow of this rotten bourgeois order through completion of the noble task of Socialist Revolution in our country.

part and parcel of the bigger movement on a broader and wider pers-

ORISSA

Workers demonstrate

Rourkela: Thousands of workers including adivasi female workers of different industries in Rourkela organised by the UTUC (Lenin Sarani) affiliated unions, demonstrated before the Chief Minister at the aerodrome on 31st October 1974. The demonstrators submitted an open letter, to the CM demanding, release of Com. Jena, withdrawal of lay-off, discharge, retrenchment orders and reinstatement of 22 discharged workers of Orissa Fertilisers & Chemicals Ltd, and supply of food-grains at cheap rates etc.

Big Public Rally

Cuttack: A big public meeting was organised by the SUCI Cuttack City Committee on 6th Nov. at Cuttack. Com. Binapani Dash presided over the meeting which was addressed by Comrades, Mayadhar Naik, Dwarika Ratha and Raghunath Dash. All the speakers while supporting the movement launched by the oppressed people of Behar raised strong voice of protest and condemnation against the police atrocities there.

Com. Shantiranjn Das Expired

Comrade Shantiranjn Das, member of the Dhanbad District Committee, SUCI, member of the Central Working Committee of South Eastern Railwaymen's Union and Secretary Bhojuti Branch and an important organiser of UTUC (Lenin Sarani), expired on 9th November at Digwadi (Dhanbad).

In the year 1955, during the movement of the railway workers, Com. Das came in touch with the party and through organising ability and untiring sincerity, he established himself as a popular organiser of the people and the party.

pective for realising secular, democratic and a scientific education system in the country.